

REMARKS

Summary of Office Action

Claims 11-15, 17-18 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Held et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,177,972) in view of Sakai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,222,603).

Summary of Amendment

Claim 11 has been amended referring to paragraphs [0037] and [0039] and claim 22 has been canceled. No new matter has been added. Hence, claims 11-15 and 17-18 are pending for consideration.

All Claims Comply With § 103

Claims 11-15, 17-18 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Held et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,177,972) in view of Sakai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,222,603). Applicant respectfully traverses.

As amended, independent claim 11 recites, in part, “wherein, when a voltage is applied across the two electrodes, the liquid crystal and photo-reactant material are arranged according to the applied electric field in the horizontal direction; wherein the photo-reactant material and the liquid crystal material have a character aligned by the same UV light, linearly polarized, as the UV light for curing the sealant; and wherein the photo-reactant material remains uncured.”

Held et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the above-noted features of the claimed invention. In particular, Held et al. discloses that the polymer network is fixed in the cell and is believed to remain substantially unaltered by the application of a switching voltage to the IPS electrodes and that the polymer network 8 in FIG. 4 (when applying electric field) remains in substantially the same orientation as in FIG. 3 (when applying no voltage). Hence, Held et al. fails to disclose that when a voltage is applied across the two electrodes, the liquid crystal and photo-reactant material are arranged according to the applied electric field in the horizontal direction as the claimed invention. Also, Held et al. fails to disclose that the photo-reactant material and the liquid crystal material have a character aligned by the same UV light, linearly polarized, as the UV light for curing the sealant; and that the photo-reactant material remains uncured as the claimed invention.

Sakai et al. does not and cannot cure at least these deficiencies. Therefore, Held et al. and Sakai et al., whether taken individually or in combination, fail to teach all the features of independent claim 11 and its dependent claims 11-15 and 17-18.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: /Xiaobin You/
Xiaobin You
Reg. No. 62,510

Dated: March 30, 2010

Customer No.: 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202-739-3000
Facsimile: 202-739-3001